

acter. Two of the chief amendments de-
sired certainly will not be, to wit: to give
the President power to veto single items of
an appropriation bill, and to give Congress
power to enact a uniform marriage and di-
vorce law. The first of these propositions
has already been added to the powers of
the Governor in the States of California,
New York, Pennsylvania, Texas, Florida,
Georgia, Louisiana, Alabama, Arkansas,
Colorado, New Jersey, Nebraska and West
Virginia. Here are thirteen States already
committed to the system, and Illinois is soon
to vote upon a constitutional amendment of
the same character. As to this, we do not
believe a division of the people of
the States can be called on. On the
second proposition there would be differ-
ences of opinion undoubtedly, but that
it should at all involve political parties is
difficult of comprehension. Of course it
would lead a death-blow to Mormonism,
but certainly the antagonism of that people
on that question is not a reason for aban-
doning the effort to get rid of our disgre-
gated non-uniformity system. The propo-
sition to give Congress power to legislate in
the interest of uniformity of laws as to
trademarks would receive the support of
the entire commercial side of the nation,
and we do not believe an objection to the
amendment would be presented worthy of
any consideration whatever. So, too, with
other amendments—there are none, or at
least few, proposed that will excite the an-
timony of party or partisans. The Con-
stitution scheme is wise, and amendment of
the Federal Constitution is practicable. To
say that we must never make the organic
law march up to the advance of ideas, is to
declare that the nation shall not benefit in
her legislative departments, or the people in
the social and domestic developments of
our civilization, and is old fogyism of the
worst stripe. It is the old story of the
stone in one end of the bag, and should not
receive consideration at the hands of an in-
telligent people.

A CHAPTER ON FOOLS.

They hanged a thing in Cincinnati the
other day by due process of law. He died
disgracefully on the gallows. Yet he only
killed his wife; choked her to death, and
was of course entitled to sympathy. Why
not? For what did he marry her, if he
had not the right to correct her? That
the "fool woman" died under the process
was simply an evidence of female per-
versity. The man was three times tried,
and three separate "fool juries" declared
that he had wantonly shed human blood.
Twice did the Courts send the case back to
the juries, and so the man's lease of life
was spun out three years by the law's de-
lay. The "fool taxpayers" footed the
bills, or will, for the "fool trials" were
costly. But this is not all, that "fool
murderer" reposed in jail a whole year
before a lot of "fool women" found him
out. At this date, however, women of the
abnormally emotional class are indulging
generally in the new craze of weeping over
murderers. In this case the discovery was
made when he was first convicted. So soon
as it was determined that he was a
simon pure murderer, and likely to stretch
in the course of a decade, he became
an object of sympathy, an ideal being,
inspiring regard and reverence. These
"fool women" with a few "fool men,"
sought him in his dun-
geon, extended their sympathies, fawned
upon him, decorated his cell with flowers
and bric-a-brac, loaded his table with rich
viands, and were blessed if even they were
permitted to touch the hem of his garment.
These fools were so numerous and so per-
sistent that even the ministers of God
could scarce find the man alive long enough
to warn him that he must give an account
for the deeds done in the body, and that
it was time for him to turn his
thoughts to the possibilities of a future
state. We are told that these "fool senti-
mentals" outdid all previous fool ex-
hibitions of idolizing in this line. They pro-
cured this sweet murderer the softest
raiment; they put in his blood-stained
hands the choicest bowls; his hours were
made soft as dewy eve by the plying
smiles of beautiful women; his mo-
ments were spent upon the zephyrs of their
rarest sighs, and his soul went on in the
scuff of the music of their dearest songs.
What is there in the female character
that renders such an exhibition possible?
What is it not and stimulant? How is
it that the murderer of a woman finds
more sympathy flowing to him from women
than from his own sex? Is it com-
passion, or congratulation, to the poor
thing for ridding himself of a "fool wife"?
Seriously, these emotional manifestations
testify to weakness of character, to a
species of morbid mental imbecility. At
the same time, they speak of a longing for
the romantic, a striving after chivalric
ideals, in which all women, to greater or
less extent, indulge in fancy. In default
of these in reality, in the prosaic friction
of every-day life the murderer
is seized upon by the abnormally emotional
of the set, who happily are, after all, few
in number compared to the mass of right-
thinking citizens, to fill the void aching
for an object upon which repressed sym-
pathy may be poured out with lavish
prodigality.

A RIGHT THING.

The bill to place General Grant on the
retired list passed the United States Sen-
ate with a vote highly complimentary to
the hero of Appomattox. Our local even-
ing contemporary intimates that the sym-
pathy being expressed for General Grant
for his recent losses is uncalled for. Not
so. He is in years; he has been led into
stock speculation and badly beaten, as has
many a wise man. Those who gambled
in stocks with him expected to win, but
both they and he have lost largely. But
that has nothing to do with placing him
upon the retired list of the army. That
is a tardy act of justice. The greatest
chieftain of our armies should not be
left off that list at all times of his
life, as much so as that of any of the
Generals upon that list now. The country
honors itself, honors a great soldier, a
patriot and a hero when it does this thing,
and the people not only applaud the act of
Congress, but do extend their sympathy to
the old warrior, who fought and won our
battles, for the unhappy mischance that
has now wrecked him in business.

NOT A PRINCIPLE.

The two gentlemen who, in the lower
House of Congress, made such vigorous
assaults upon the Chinese restriction bill,
have been made the subjects of some severe
criticism. We believe they were thor-
oughly conscientious. They had nothing
to gain or lose by the defeat of the bill, or
its passage, nor could it possibly affect
their constituents for many years one way
or the other. Mr. Hitt really advanced
the thought and sentiment of a great body
of his people, that makes them pro-Chinese
in idea, that the exclusion bill is
opposed to the traditions of the country
and is in violation of what has been pro-
posed, and indirectly, to be one of the
cornerstones of the national fabric, that
this is a free house of refuge, in which
whosoever will possesses a right. But the
bill is becoming more broadly mani-
fest daily that the American people do
not recognize this as a principle and never
have. It has been a dogma of the stump and
Fourth of July orators, but is not to be
found in our political superstructure, or
our constitutional substructure. The popu-
lar belief to the contrary—now relaxing—
has been the cause of much evil to the
country. It has belittled us abroad quite
as much as it has popularized us; it has given
us a very loose system of naturalization
laws, and has made political demagoguery
and venality ruling powers. We are, how-
ever, on the eve of two important events—the
distinct announcement to the whole world
that we reserve the right to say what per-
sons shall sit at our hearthstone, and the
reform of the naturalization laws, to the
end that the process of becoming a citizen

THE TRIUMPH OF FRANCE.

The treaty which France has just made
with China concedes everything the former
demanded of the latter, except, perhaps,
the money indemnity originally insisted
upon. But this France never expected to
receive. The demand was a weapon only,
and she used it for a purpose. A year ago
we pronounced the claim of China of suzer-
ainty over Annam a shallow pretense.
China now confesses that it was a sham.
We then pointed out that the French
would be justified in extending their pro-
tectorate over Annam, and now China con-
cedes it. A year ago we expressed our be-
lief that the delta of the Red river would
be cleared, and the stream itself opened up
anew to commerce, and now it is announced
as accomplished. Instead of a frontier line
of gong-beating garrisons, and a war along
the border, three Chinese provinces are to
be opened up to trade, and this at the de-
mand of the French. The Black Flags have
been dispersed, the Chinese sent
about their business, commercial pro-
tection, a safe government set up and peace
assured, and all through the wise
policy of the French Republic. Yet the
most of our own journals but a little while
ago doubted that policy, and expressed
fears that France would fail, and even
went so far as to hold that her claims were
untenable, and should not receive the coun-
tenance of the nations of the world. But
success has crowned the efforts of the
French Republic, civilization has triumphed
over semi-barbarism, and the Oriental has
again been taught that treaty rights must
be respected, and the property and persons
of foreigners not be given up to the frenzy
of mobs, or to plundering by banditti.

A RIGHT THING.

The bill to place General Grant on the
retired list passed the United States Sen-
ate with a vote highly complimentary to
the hero of Appomattox. Our local even-
ing contemporary intimates that the sym-
pathy being expressed for General Grant
for his recent losses is uncalled for. Not
so. He is in years; he has been led into
stock speculation and badly beaten, as has
many a wise man. Those who gambled
in stocks with him expected to win, but
both they and he have lost largely. But
that has nothing to do with placing him
upon the retired list of the army. That
is a tardy act of justice. The greatest
chieftain of our armies should not be
left off that list at all times of his
life, as much so as that of any of the
Generals upon that list now. The country
honors itself, honors a great soldier, a
patriot and a hero when it does this thing,
and the people not only applaud the act of
Congress, but do extend their sympathy to
the old warrior, who fought and won our
battles, for the unhappy mischance that
has now wrecked him in business.

NOT A PRINCIPLE.

The two gentlemen who, in the lower
House of Congress, made such vigorous
assaults upon the Chinese restriction bill,
have been made the subjects of some severe
criticism. We believe they were thor-
oughly conscientious. They had nothing
to gain or lose by the defeat of the bill, or
its passage, nor could it possibly affect
their constituents for many years one way
or the other. Mr. Hitt really advanced
the thought and sentiment of a great body
of his people, that makes them pro-Chinese
in idea, that the exclusion bill is
opposed to the traditions of the country
and is in violation of what has been pro-
posed, and indirectly, to be one of the
cornerstones of the national fabric, that
this is a free house of refuge, in which
whosoever will possesses a right. But the
bill is becoming more broadly mani-
fest daily that the American people do
not recognize this as a principle and never
have. It has been a dogma of the stump and
Fourth of July orators, but is not to be
found in our political superstructure, or
our constitutional substructure. The popu-
lar belief to the contrary—now relaxing—
has been the cause of much evil to the
country. It has belittled us abroad quite
as much as it has popularized us; it has given
us a very loose system of naturalization
laws, and has made political demagoguery
and venality ruling powers. We are, how-
ever, on the eve of two important events—the
distinct announcement to the whole world
that we reserve the right to say what per-
sons shall sit at our hearthstone, and the
reform of the naturalization laws, to the
end that the process of becoming a citizen

IS IT PRACTICABLE?

The Interoceanic, referring to the propo-
sition made by a writer in the Princeton
Review, and recently discussed in these
columns, for a Convention of picked men
to meet on the one hundredth anniversary
of the adoption of the Federal Constitu-
tion, to propose amendments to it, says:
"No doubt amendments are needed, and
ought to be secured, but it is very doubtful
if they could be, even if a Convention
were to be held. The ratification neces-
sary to give any amendment vitality would
be difficult to secure, and, in fact, impos-
sible, if any element of party politics were
involved, however indirectly. The framers
of the Constitution made the altera-
tion of that instrument exceedingly
hard." And it quotes the late
Alexander H. Stephens as once saying:
"I very much doubt if we have not passed
the period in our Republic's life when the
amendment to the Constitution is practi-
cable; whether any, however apparently
proper, could be made; whether, in a word,
for the balance of our existence, long or
short, we must not make up our minds to
get along as well as we can, and do the best
we can with the Constitution as it is."

It was in 1860 that Mr. Stephens ex-
pressed these doubts. Very soon after the
Constitution was amended, though we ad-
mit it was under the most phenomenal
conditions. The ease with which the
Constitution may be amended is largely
dependent upon what is proposed for the
matter. It does not follow that proposed
amendments will be political in their char-

acter. Two of the chief amendments de-
sired certainly will not be, to wit: to give
the President power to veto single items of
an appropriation bill, and to give Congress
power to enact a uniform marriage and di-
vorce law. The first of these propositions
has already been added to the powers of
the Governor in the States of California,
New York, Pennsylvania, Texas, Florida,
Georgia, Louisiana, Alabama, Arkansas,
Colorado, New Jersey, Nebraska and West
Virginia. Here are thirteen States already
committed to the system, and Illinois is soon
to vote upon a constitutional amendment of
the same character. As to this, we do not
believe a division of the people of
the States can be called on. On the
second proposition there would be differ-
ences of opinion undoubtedly, but that
it should at all involve political parties is
difficult of comprehension. Of course it
would lead a death-blow to Mormonism,
but certainly the antagonism of that people
on that question is not a reason for aban-
doning the effort to get rid of our disgre-
gated non-uniformity system. The propo-
sition to give Congress power to legislate in
the interest of uniformity of laws as to
trademarks would receive the support of
the entire commercial side of the nation,
and we do not believe an objection to the
amendment would be presented worthy of
any consideration whatever. So, too, with
other amendments—there are none, or at
least few, proposed that will excite the an-
timony of party or partisans. The Con-
stitution scheme is wise, and amendment of
the Federal Constitution is practicable. To
say that we must never make the organic
law march up to the advance of ideas, is to
declare that the nation shall not benefit in
her legislative departments, or the people in
the social and domestic developments of
our civilization, and is old fogyism of the
worst stripe. It is the old story of the
stone in one end of the bag, and should not
receive consideration at the hands of an in-
telligent people.

THE TRIUMPH OF FRANCE.

The treaty which France has just made
with China concedes everything the former
demanded of the latter, except, perhaps,
the money indemnity originally insisted
upon. But this France never expected to
receive. The demand was a weapon only,
and she used it for a purpose. A year ago
we pronounced the claim of China of suzer-
ainty over Annam a shallow pretense.
China now confesses that it was a sham.
We then pointed out that the French
would be justified in extending their pro-
tectorate over Annam, and now China con-
cedes it. A year ago we expressed our be-
lief that the delta of the Red river would
be cleared, and the stream itself opened up
anew to commerce, and now it is announced
as accomplished. Instead of a frontier line
of gong-beating garrisons, and a war along
the border, three Chinese provinces are to
be opened up to trade, and this at the de-
mand of the French. The Black Flags have
been dispersed, the Chinese sent
about their business, commercial pro-
tection, a safe government set up and peace
assured, and all through the wise
policy of the French Republic. Yet the
most of our own journals but a little while
ago doubted that policy, and expressed
fears that France would fail, and even
went so far as to hold that her claims were
untenable, and should not receive the coun-
tenance of the nations of the world. But
success has crowned the efforts of the
French Republic, civilization has triumphed
over semi-barbarism, and the Oriental has
again been taught that treaty rights must
be respected, and the property and persons
of foreigners not be given up to the frenzy
of mobs, or to plundering by banditti.

A RIGHT THING.

The bill to place General Grant on the
retired list passed the United States Sen-
ate with a vote highly complimentary to
the hero of Appomattox. Our local even-
ing contemporary intimates that the sym-
pathy being expressed for General Grant
for his recent losses is uncalled for. Not
so. He is in years; he has been led into
stock speculation and badly beaten, as has
many a wise man. Those who gambled
in stocks with him expected to win, but
both they and he have lost largely. But
that has nothing to do with placing him
upon the retired list of the army. That
is a tardy act of justice. The greatest
chieftain of our armies should not be
left off that list at all times of his
life, as much so as that of any of the
Generals upon that list now. The country
honors itself, honors a great soldier, a
patriot and a hero when it does this thing,
and the people not only applaud the act of
Congress, but do extend their sympathy to
the old warrior, who fought and won our
battles, for the unhappy mischance that
has now wrecked him in business.

NOT A PRINCIPLE.

The two gentlemen who, in the lower
House of Congress, made such vigorous
assaults upon the Chinese restriction bill,
have been made the subjects of some severe
criticism. We believe they were thor-
oughly conscientious. They had nothing
to gain or lose by the defeat of the bill, or
its passage, nor could it possibly affect
their constituents for many years one way
or the other. Mr. Hitt really advanced
the thought and sentiment of a great body
of his people, that makes them pro-Chinese
in idea, that the exclusion bill is
opposed to the traditions of the country
and is in violation of what has been pro-
posed, and indirectly, to be one of the
cornerstones of the national fabric, that
this is a free house of refuge, in which
whosoever will possesses a right. But the
bill is becoming more broadly mani-
fest daily that the American people do
not recognize this as a principle and never
have. It has been a dogma of the stump and
Fourth of July orators, but is not to be
found in our political superstructure, or
our constitutional substructure. The popu-
lar belief to the contrary—now relaxing—
has been the cause of much evil to the
country. It has belittled us abroad quite
as much as it has popularized us; it has given
us a very loose system of naturalization
laws, and has made political demagoguery
and venality ruling powers. We are, how-
ever, on the eve of two important events—the
distinct announcement to the whole world
that we reserve the right to say what per-
sons shall sit at our hearthstone, and the
reform of the naturalization laws, to the
end that the process of becoming a citizen

IS IT PRACTICABLE?

The Interoceanic, referring to the propo-
sition made by a writer in the Princeton
Review, and recently discussed in these
columns, for a Convention of picked men
to meet on the one hundredth anniversary
of the adoption of the Federal Constitu-
tion, to propose amendments to it, says:
"No doubt amendments are needed, and
ought to be secured, but it is very doubtful
if they could be, even if a Convention
were to be held. The ratification neces-
sary to give any amendment vitality would
be difficult to secure, and, in fact, impos-
sible, if any element of party politics were
involved, however indirectly. The framers
of the Constitution made the altera-
tion of that instrument exceedingly
hard." And it quotes the late
Alexander H. Stephens as once saying:
"I very much doubt if we have not passed
the period in our Republic's life when the
amendment to the Constitution is practi-
cable; whether any, however apparently
proper, could be made; whether, in a word,
for the balance of our existence, long or
short, we must not make up our minds to
get along as well as we can, and do the best
we can with the Constitution as it is."

It was in 1860 that Mr. Stephens ex-
pressed these doubts. Very soon after the
Constitution was amended, though we ad-
mit it was under the most phenomenal
conditions. The ease with which the
Constitution may be amended is largely
dependent upon what is proposed for the
matter. It does not follow that proposed
amendments will be political in their char-

OUR CLAIM UPON CONGRESS.

The Marysville Appeal asks if the valley
has not a claim upon Congress for remun-
eration: "Ought not cities, counties and
individuals, who donate money to bring
hydraulic mining to a close, be entitled to
future Congressional remuneration because
the navigable rivers of the State will be
saved by money obtained from this neces-
sary expenditure? The Federal Govern-
ment should have intervened years ago, as
the Secretary of War has of late, and
stopped the hydraulic miners from filling
the river channels and incumbering the
bars with detritus. But if this desirable
intervention is accomplished for the Na-
tional Government by local means, why
will not the parties to the action have a
just claim upon the Federal Government
for all the money advanced and expended
in interrupting a destructive nuisance
which the Government itself should have
never allowed to progress a day after its
destructive effects became evident to the
National authorities? Such a claim may be
preferred, but it is not probable that even the
Appeal seriously believes for a moment
anything would ever come of it. It would
stand precisely upon the same footing as
any other beggling petition. Whatever
equity there may be in such a "claim,"
certainly no thoughtful persons advance
money to aid the valley with any idea
whatever of receiving it back from the
Federal Government. The argument of
the Appeal runs like this: It is the duty
of the Federal Government to preserve the
navigability of the rivers; if it neg-
lects to do so, and riparian dwellers do the
needed work, are they not entitled to re-
muneration? Yes; but they will never
receive it from Congress. The National
Legislature is the judge of the necessities
of the rivers, so far as appropriations go,
and will never set up the precedent of pay-
ing back to the people who prosecute them
who injure the streams the sum of their
expenses. It will never agree that citizens
may do for the Government what they have
not resolved shall be done, with any hope
of being reimbursed. It would be a dan-
gerous policy to inaugurate.

IS IT PRACTICABLE?

The Interoceanic, referring to the propo-
sition made by a writer in the Princeton
Review, and recently discussed in these
columns, for a Convention of picked men
to meet on the one hundredth anniversary
of the adoption of the Federal Constitu-
tion, to propose amendments to it, says:
"No doubt amendments are needed, and
ought to be secured, but it is very doubtful
if they could be, even if a Convention
were to be held. The ratification neces-
sary to give any amendment vitality would
be difficult to secure, and, in fact, impos-
sible, if any element of party politics were
involved, however indirectly. The framers
of the Constitution made the altera-
tion of that instrument exceedingly
hard." And it quotes the late
Alexander H. Stephens as once saying:
"I very much doubt if we have not passed
the period in our Republic's life when the
amendment to the Constitution is practi-
cable; whether any, however apparently
proper, could be made; whether, in a word,
for the balance of our existence, long or
short, we must not make up our minds to
get along as well as we can, and do the best
we can with the Constitution as it is."

It was in 1860 that Mr. Stephens ex-
pressed these doubts. Very soon after the
Constitution was amended, though we ad-
mit it was under the most phenomenal
conditions. The ease with which the
Constitution may be amended is largely
dependent upon what is proposed for the
matter. It does not follow that proposed
amendments will be political in their char-

acter. Two of the chief amendments de-
sired certainly will not be, to wit: to give
the President power to veto single items of
an appropriation bill, and to give Congress
power to enact a uniform marriage and di-
vorce law. The first of these propositions
has already been added to the powers of
the Governor in the States of California,
New York, Pennsylvania, Texas, Florida,
Georgia, Louisiana, Alabama, Arkansas,
Colorado, New Jersey, Nebraska and West
Virginia. Here are thirteen States already
committed to the system, and Illinois is soon
to vote upon a constitutional amendment of
the same character. As to this, we do not
believe a division of the people of
the States can be called on. On the
second proposition there would be differ-
ences of opinion undoubtedly, but that
it should at all involve political parties is
difficult of comprehension. Of course it
would lead a death-blow to Mormonism,
but certainly the antagonism of that people
on that question is not a reason for aban-
doning the effort to get rid of our disgre-
gated non-uniformity system. The propo-
sition to give Congress power to legislate in
the interest of uniformity of laws as to
trademarks would receive the support of
the entire commercial side of the nation,
and we do not believe an objection to the
amendment would be presented worthy of
any consideration whatever. So, too, with
other amendments—there are none, or at
least few, proposed that will excite the an-
timony of party or partisans. The Con-
stitution scheme is wise, and amendment of
the Federal Constitution is practicable. To
say that we must never make the organic
law march up to the advance of ideas, is to
declare that the nation shall not benefit in
her legislative departments, or the people in
the social and domestic developments of
our civilization, and is old fogyism of the
worst stripe. It is the old story of the
stone in one end of the bag, and should not
receive consideration at the hands of an in-
telligent people.

A CHAPTER ON FOOLS.

They hanged a thing in Cincinnati the
other day by due process of law. He died
disgracefully on the gallows. Yet he only
killed his wife; choked her to death, and
was of course entitled to sympathy. Why
not? For what did he marry her, if he
had not the right to correct her? That
the "fool woman" died under the process
was simply an evidence of female per-
versity. The man was three times tried,
and three separate "fool juries" declared
that he had wantonly shed human blood.
Twice did the Courts send the case back to
the juries, and so the man's lease of life
was spun out three years by the law's de-
lay. The "fool taxpayers" footed the
bills, or will, for the "fool trials" were
costly. But this is not all, that "fool
murderer" reposed in jail a whole year
before a lot of "fool women" found him
out. At this date, however, women of the
abnormally emotional class are indulging
generally in the new craze of weeping over
murderers. In this case the discovery was
made when he was first convicted. So soon
as it was determined that he was a
simon pure murderer, and likely to stretch
in the course of a decade, he became
an object of sympathy, an ideal being,
inspiring regard and reverence. These
"fool women" with a few "fool men,"
sought him in his dun-
geon, extended their sympathies, fawned
upon him, decorated his cell with flowers
and bric-a-brac, loaded his table with rich
viands, and were blessed if even they were
permitted to touch the hem of his garment.
These fools were so numerous and so per-
sistent that even the ministers of God
could scarce find the man alive long enough
to warn him that he must give an account
for the deeds done in the body, and that
it was time for him to turn his
thoughts to the possibilities of a future
state. We are told that these "fool senti-
mentals" outdid all previous fool ex-
hibitions of idolizing in this line. They pro-
cured this sweet murderer the softest
raiment; they put in his blood-stained
hands the choicest bowls; his hours were
made soft as dewy eve by the plying
smiles of beautiful women; his mo-
ments were spent upon the zephyrs of their
rarest sighs, and his soul went on in the
scuff of the music of their dearest songs.
What is there in the female character
that renders such an exhibition possible?
What is it not and stimulant? How is
it that the murderer of a woman finds
more sympathy flowing to him from women
than from his own sex? Is it com-
passion, or congratulation, to the poor
thing for ridding himself of a "fool wife"?
Seriously, these emotional manifestations
testify to weakness of character, to a
species of morbid mental imbecility. At
the same time, they speak of a longing for
the romantic, a striving after chivalric
ideals, in which all women, to greater or
less extent, indulge in fancy. In default
of these in reality, in the prosaic friction
of every-day life the murderer
is

